



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1/11

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,047	10/26/2001	Hawkins Yao	069099.0102	7049
31625	7590	01/31/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2151		
DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,047	YAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/6/06.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed on November 9, 2005.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements filed January 6, 2006 and August 16, 2005, have been received and considered by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, and 21-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al. (hereinafter Schmidt), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0034178.

6. In considering claim 1, Schmidt teaches a method for assigning an internal port address to uniquely identify a port associated with a routing processor of a network device associated with, and having a location within, a system, comprising: allocating a location section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within the system, (page 2, paragraph 13, page 7, paragraph 102, Fig. 5); allocating a routing processor section of the internal port address corresponding to a routing processor associated with the routing processor, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5); and allocating a port section of the internal port address corresponding to the port, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-8, 21-32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of Battou et al. (hereinafter Battou), U.S. Patent Pub No. 2003/0163555 (previously made of record and not relied upon).

9. In considering claims 2 and 29, although the teachings of Schmidt disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: allocating a

shelf section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a shelf.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a shelf, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose allocating a shelf section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a shelf. This would have facilitated locating the network device since certain slots within a shelf are typically reserved for certain network devices, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

10. In considering claims 3, 6, 22, and 25, Battou teaches the network device is associated with at least one geographical locator indicator, (page 8, paragraph 120); and the shelf section is derived from the geographical locator indicator, (page 8, paragraph 120). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Schmidt with Battou for reasons indicated in considering claims 2, 4, 21 and 23.

11. In considering claims 4 and 23, although the teachings of Schmidt disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: allocating a slot section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a slot.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a slot, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose allocating a slot section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a slot. This would have facilitated locating the network device since certain slots are typically reserved for certain network devices, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

12. In considering claims 5 and 24, Battou teaches the slot is located within a shelf, (page 8, paragraph 120). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Schmidt with Battou for reasons indicated in considering claim 4.

13. In considering claims 7, 26, and 31, the teachings of Schmidt suggest a routing processor is associated with a PCI slot ID, and the routing processor section is derived from the PCI slot ID, (page 1, paragraph 4, and page 4, paragraphs 56-68).

Although the teachings of Schmidt suggest substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: a slot with a slot ID.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a slot, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Schmidt, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of

Schmidt with Battou to disclose a slot with a slot ID. This would have facilitated locating the network device since certain slots are typically reserved for certain network devices, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

14. In considering claims 8, 27, and 32, the teachings of Schmidt suggest the network device is a line card, (page 4, paragraph 56, also see Fig. 4).

Although the teachings of Schmidt suggest substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: a line card.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a slot, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Schmidt, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose a line card. This would have advantageously demonstrated locating a line card since certain slots are typically reserved for certain line cards, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

15. In considering claim 21, Schmidt teaches a method for assigning an internal port address to uniquely identify a port associated with a routing processor of a network device associated with, and having a location within, a system, comprising: allocating a location section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within the system, (page 2, paragraph 13, page 7, paragraph 102, Fig. 5); allocating a routing processor section of the internal port address corresponding to a

routing processor associated with the routing processor, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5); and allocating a port section of the internal port address corresponding to the port, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5).

Although the teachings of Schmidt disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: allocating a shelf section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a shelf.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a shelf, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose allocating a shelf section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a shelf. This would have facilitated locating the network device since certain slots within a shelf are typically reserved for certain network devices, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

16. In considering claim 28, Schmidt teaches a method for assigning an internal port address to uniquely identify a port associated with a routing processor of a network device associated with, and having a location within, a system, comprising: allocating a location section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within the system, (page 2, paragraph 13, page 7, paragraph 102, Fig. 5); allocating a routing processor section of the internal port address corresponding to a routing processor associated with the routing processor, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5);

and allocating a port section of the internal port address corresponding to the port, (page 4, paragraph 59, Fig. 5).

Although the teachings of Schmidt disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network device associated with at least one geographical locator indicator such that the location section is derived from the geographical locator indicator.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: at least one geographical locator indicator such that a location section is derived from the geographical locator indicator, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose the network device associated with at least one geographical locator indicator such that the location section is derived from the geographical locator indicator. This would have facilitated locating the network device within a geographical location, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

17. In considering claim 30, although the teachings of Schmidt disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: allocating a slot section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a slot, the slot selection located within a shelf.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Battou teaches: receiving a line card ID corresponding to the location of the line card within a slot, the slot selection located within a shelf, (page 8, paragraph 120).

Thus, given the teachings of Battou, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Schmidt with Battou to disclose allocating a slot section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a slot, the slot selection located within a shelf. This would have facilitated locating the network device since certain slots are typically reserved for certain network devices, (Battou, page 8, paragraph 120).

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
1/26/06


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER